

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Miyake et al. (EP 1 001 374 A21).

Claims 2-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawings

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted the drawings as originally filed with this application.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 2 and amended claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 2-6 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 2, thus redrafting claim 2 in independent form. Original claim 4 and amended claims 3, 5, and 6 all depend from amended claim 4. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claim 2, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Application No. 10/758,088


Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 24, 2007

By:


John R. Guice, Jr.
Reg. No. 39,699

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 40144